

RESPONSE AND REMARKS

Amendments to Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17 and 18 are filed concurrently herewith to more distinctly claim the invention. Entry of the amendments, and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

SPECIFICATION

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner objected to use of various trademarks as used in the specification and indicated that the trademarks should be capitalized wherever they appear. Responsive to the Examiner's objections to the use of trademarks, further amendments to the specification are re-submitted herewith. The further amendments to the specification identify trademarks used in the specification, reference the proprietary nature of those trademarks through the use of the "TM" symbol, and equate the TM-designated trademark with both an all-capitalized version of the trademark and with alternative ways in which the trademarks appear in the specification.

In addition, further amendments to the specification are submitted herewith to make minor corrections to the specification, such as indicating reference numbers present in the drawings, and other minor corrections. No new matter is added as a result of the amendments to the specification.

SECTION 102

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner renewed the previous rejection of Claims 1-21 under section 102(b) as being anticipated by Nicholls et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,485,369; "Nicholls").

The Examiner's rejection of Claims 1-21 under section 102(b) has been carefully considered. Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17 and 18 have been amended to more distinctly recite the claimed invention. For the reasons described below, the amended Claims and the previously presented Claims of the present application are respectfully submitted to be patentably distinct from the cited reference, whether considered alone or in combination.

It is respectfully submitted that there is no disclosure in Nicholls of a determination as to "whether [a] carrier would support shipping of the particular parcel according to the respective set of shipping location rules for the carrier as applied to the parcel specifications for the particular parcel and the respective default shipping location associated with the respective user...." as claimed in amended independent Claims 1, 8, and 15. Further, it is respectfully submitted that Nicholls does not disclose or suggest "generat[ing] a simultaneous online display of at least one delivery service for each carrier that would support shipping of the particular parcel from the respective default shipping location" as claimed in one way or another in amended independent Claims 1, 8 and 15.

It is respectfully submitted that, similarly, there is no disclosure in Nicholls of an identification of "each carrier of a plurality of carriers that would support shipping the particular respective parcel from a respective user-specific default shipping location that is associated with the particular respective user, wherein each carrier of a plurality of carriers that would support shipping the particular respective parcel from the respective user-specific default shipping location is identified according a respective set of shipping location rules for the carrier as applied to the respective default shipping location associated with the respective user..." as claimed in amended independent Claims 2, 9, and 16. Further, it is respectfully submitted that Nicholls does not disclose or suggest "generat[ing] a simultaneous online display of at least one delivery service for each carrier that would support shipping of the particular respective parcel from the respective user-specific default shipping location" as claimed in one way or another in amended independent Claims 2, 9, and 16

Further, it is respectfully submitted that there is no disclosure in Nicholls of a determination as to "whether the respective carrier would support shipping of a particular parcel according to a respective set of shipping location rules for the respective carrier as applied to the respective default shipping location input by the respective particular user..." as claimed in amended independent Claims 3, 10, and 17. Further, it is respectfully submitted that Nicholls does not disclose or

suggest "generate a simultaneous online display of at least one delivery service for each respective carrier that would support shipping of the particular parcel from the respective default shipping location" as claimed in one way or another in amended independent Claims 3, 10, and 17.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Nicholls, whether considered alone or in combination with any other reference of record, does not disclose, anticipate, or suggest, the subject matter of the previously amended claims of the present application.

For the foregoing reasons and for the reasons previously given, because amended independent Claims 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 15, 16 and 17, are patentable over the cited reference, it is respectfully submitted that dependent Claims 4 through 7, 12 through 14, and 19 through 21, are therefore also patentable over the cited reference.

In view of the foregoing reasons and for the reasons previously given, it is respectfully submitted that the invention disclosed and claimed in the Claims of the present amended application is not fairly taught by any of the references of record, taken either alone or in combination, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the present application be reconsidered and allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

KHORSANDI PATENT LAW GROUP, ALC

By



Marilyn R. Khorsandi
Reg. No. 45,744
626/796-2856